

Voice in the Persian *Hajji Baba*

Esmail Haddadian-Moghaddam and Anthony Pym

When the picaresque novel *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* was published in Persian in 1905, it contained a critique of Persian autocratic tradition, contrasting it with the relative modernity of Constantinople. Who wrote the critique? Who was speaking through the novel? This study traces the multiple mediating voices, some editorial, some translational, that enabled a critical modernity to move across worlds.

Key words: voice in translation, agency, modernity, picaresque, 19th century Persia

Lorsque le roman *Les Aventures de Hadji Baba d'Ispahan* parût en langue perse en 1905, le texte portait une critique directe de la tradition autocrate perse, opposée à la modernité relative de Constantinople. Qui avait écrit la critique ? Qui parlait à travers le roman ? Notre étude reprend les traces des multiples voix médiatrices, certaines traductives, d'autres éditoriales, qui facilitaient le passage entre mondes d'une aspiration à la modernité critique.

Mots clés : voix en traduction, action traductive, modernité, picaresque, Perse au XIX^e siècle

1905: Hajji Baba speaks Persian¹

In the picaresque novel *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*, printed in Persian in 1905, we read:

اگر اینجا جاست، پس ایران کجاست؟ اینجا دارالنعیم است، آنجا دارالجحیم: اینجا دارالصفاء، آنجا دارالعزا: اینجا عزت است و گنج، آنجا ذلت و رنج: اینجا سلطنت است و نظافت، آنجا درویش و کثافت: اینجا تماشا خانه، آنجا تکیه خانه: اینجا بازی، آنجا شبیه: اینجا عیش، آنجا تعزیه: اینجا آواز، آنجا روضه. خوش گذرانی و عیش و نوش ترکان با آن عزاداری شبانه روز ایرانیان را بخاطر آورده بر بخت بد گریستم.²

As in all exotic epics (*Hajji Baba* became a 1954 Hollywood film), the foreign fades away, as if by magic, to reveal what we want to know:

If this is a place, then what is Persia? This is heaven, Persia is hell; this is a pleasant house, that is a mourning house; here we find honor and treasure, there degradation and suffering; here governance and cleanliness, there dervishes and dirt; here the theater, there *takiyeh*; here a game, there *shabih*; here the life of pleasure, there *taziye*; here song, there *ruzeh*. Remembering the Ottomans' life of pleasure and Persians' round-the-clock life of mourning, I decried my bad luck [at having been born in Persia].³

Much as the traditional picaresque hero is supposed to dissect society from below, here the critique works through comparison. Constantinople, where Hajji Baba has just arrived, offers all things good; Persia, from whence he has come, suffers from all things bad. Note, though, that the badness in this case is remarkably clerical: *takiyeh* is an Islamic theater, *shabih* is a religious drama; *taziye* is an indigenous religious play; *ruzeh* is religious song; so Persian institutional religion does not score well. Neither, in general terms of the novel, does the despotism with which the Persian Qajar regime maintained social hierarchies. Here, as in many moments since, what is now Turkey might be the model of a modernizing Islamic state.

The voice that speaks here is comparatively critical, politically critical, religiously critical, dangerously critical. It is the voice of an aspiration to modernity, speaking in a time, place and language given to resisting modernity.

But Hajji Baba, may Allah help him, was and remains a fictional character. So who exactly was speaking through this voice?

1905: Persia

The question of Hajji Baba's voice might be of some historical importance. The year 1905, when the above text was published, marked the beginning of Persia's Constitutional Revolution, leading to the establishment of a parliament, a constitutional monarchy and a first "House of Justice".⁴ The critique of Qajar despotism was not merely literary; the aspiration to modernity was also highly political.

Of course, one could not say that Hajji Baba caused the Revolution, nor that the Revolution caused Hajji Baba. Harbsmeier⁵ more fairly sees this text, which had a certain distribution in manuscript form prior to its publication, as helping to form a political opposition within Persia,

as just one part of a network of dissidence. So the voice, at its most general level, might be the discourse of that opposition, felt to be collective even when instanced individually.

The Qajar family ruled Persia from 1785 to 1925 (surviving as a constitutional monarchy after 1906). Although they restored the country's stability and maintained some authority over its borders, they remained despotic and showed little tolerance of dissidents. They were not, nevertheless, immune to modernity. An early fundamental change came at the time of Persia's first round of defeats against Russian troops between 1804 and 1813. Crown prince Abbas Mirzā saw an urgent need not only to reform the Persian military, but also to introduce modern education. He dispatched the first Persian students abroad,⁶ and Amir Kabir, chief minister to the Qajar king, established *Dar al-funun*, the first modern school, in 1851. These initiatives, formulated from within the regime, sowed the seeds of a critical modernity.

As the nineteenth century progressed, the Persian press and dissidents formed a network of exile that reached Kolkata in India, Constantinople in Turkey, London in Britain, and Berlin in Germany, all of which attracted Persian intellectuals. Many of these exiles published in Persian-language newspapers: *Akhtar* (Constantinople), *Qanun* (London) and *Habl al-matin* (Kolkata) were banned in Persia but nevertheless found their way to the educated class there. Kolkata played a key role in that it had several active Persian printing houses.⁷ Persian in the Indian subcontinent was once both a lingua franca and had been the administrative language of the English East India Company prior to the imposition of English in 1835.⁸ It was not entirely by accident that Hajji Baba's voice, having circulated in manuscript form, was printed in Kolkata in 1905.

So how did it get there?

1901-03: Kerman, Persia

We move to Kerman, a city in the central south of modern-day Iran. In the years immediately prior to the Persian Constitutional Revolution, Kerman was where a British major by the name of Douglas Craven Phillott (1860-1930) served as consul for two years, probably from 1901 to 1903. Phillott knew Persian and had a mixed military, diplomatic and academic background. He was an active member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, a Persian translator, fluent in Arabic and Hindustani, and had several publications to his name. One way or another, Phillott came into possession of a manuscript version of the Persian *Hajji Baba*, the text of our voice. When his commission as consul came to an end, Phillott moved to Kolkata, and it was there that he was responsible for having the Persian text published.

We thus find the Persian voice, in its published form, filtered and prefaced by an English major, described in the frontispiece as “23rd Cavalry F.F, Secretary to the Board of Examiners, Calcutta, Translator for the Government of India.” The book itself was published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, of which Phillott was Secretary. *Hajji Baba* was presented as a textbook suitable for the entertainment of learners of Persian, which sounds innocuous enough. A close analysis of the edition⁹ nevertheless suggests that the text was equally aimed at a Persian readership in Persia, which is what one would expect given the role of Kolkata as a node in the dissident network.

Phillott is a key figure here not just because he moved the voice from Kerman to Kolkata, and not just because he transferred dissidence from manuscript to print. He also edited the Persian text as what he knew it to be: a translation from English. The Englishman corrected the Persian in line with the English text, and added a few mistakes himself.

The important thing was not really the presence or absence of mistakes; it was the political status of a translational voice. In Phillott’s preface to the book we read:

When an MS. copy of Sheikh Ahmad's translation first reached his native city [Kerman], it was looked on as an original work: it was copied with eagerness; it was read with excitement. [...] Was it not the first novel that had ever been written in Persian? The Persians[...] had no objection to be satirized by one of their own people. The skill with which their countryman had depicted certain noble characters and well-marked types, filled them with pride [until] one sad day some copies of the English original reached me from India, and Haji Baba ceased to be popular: "Faranani tu-yi kuk-i ma rafta" ["Our legs have been pulled by a European"], said the Persians: "this author has overstepped the bounds; he has made fun of everyone from the Shah downwards." *Haji Baba* was no longer an original work by a Persian.¹⁰

It is not clear whether Phillott himself was responsible for revealing the translational status of the text, but it seems quite plausible: it is hard to believe he was not aware of the original text, given what Browne in 1895 described as its popularity among "cultivated Englishmen."¹¹ The effect on the dissident voice would seem to have been quite radical: the comparisons with Constantinople, originally accepted as comical if critical self-reflection from within, became unacceptable when seen as translation from abroad – the picaresque hero should not speak with a foreign voice; modernity is apparently less acceptable when translated.

If the voice was not Persian, where was it from?

Phillott does not mention the name of any author on the title page of the Persian version, but he does name the translator as "Sheikh Ahmad", whose portrait is actually reproduced at the beginning of the book.

So who was Ahmad? Phillott tells us that he belonged to the "obnoxious" Babi sect, which sought to have the Persian religious leaders "make common cause with the Sunnis and join with Turkey in resisting the 'oppression of foreigners.'"¹² The comparison with Constantinople might begin to make sense.

There remains the problem of why a British army major would reproduce and correct the work of "obnoxious" activists who oppose foreigners? Whose side was Phillott on? He was an ambiguous character, to say the least. Among much else he was the unmarried impassioned translator of a Persian treatise on falconry, dedicated to the former Persian Governor of Kerman,

in memory of the time the two “mingled our tears over our exile.”¹³ The exiles may form a common land.

1886: Tabriz, Persia

The translator named by Phillott was Haji Sheikh Ahmad Ruhi Kermani (henceforth “Ahmad”), a copyist and a teacher of Persian and Arabic. He lived in political exile in Constantinople. As Phillott mentions, he very probably had some connection with the Babi movement, which broke from the Shiite belief in the return of the twelfth Imam. The movement faced severe prosecution by the Qajars and was largely forced into exile.¹⁴ Ahmad was probably also an associate of the political activist S. J. Asadabadi, known as Afghani, an ideologist and political activist who opposed both British imperialism and Qajar despotism.

Ahmad’s political and academic activism operated within the wider network of dissidents.¹⁵ His political exchanges with Muslim theologians incited the Persian authorities to ask the Ottomans to extradite him to Persia. The reason given was his association with the political circle that assassinated the Qajar monarch Nasir al-Din Shah, in 1896. The Ottomans conceded. Ahmad and two other members of the circle were extradited to Persia and were executed in Tabriz in 1896. Among Ahmad’s belongings was a copy of the Persian translation, apparently in Ahmad’s handwriting.

Browne reports a letter from Ahmad that asks for possible help with the publication of the translation.¹⁶ In this letter, however, Ahmad does not claim to be the translator. Indeed, he names someone called Mirza as the translator and highlights Mirza’s problems in finding a publisher. So the voice, although speaking from Constantinople, was probably not Ahmad’s.

There is a missing link here, since we do not know how the manuscript was moved from Tabriz, where Ahmad was executed in 1896, to Kerman, where Phillott read it sometime after 1901. That

missing link might also explain why Phillott made a mistake in naming Ahmad as the translator. It could be that the manuscript did not mention Mirza as the translator, or that Ahmad had put his own name as the translator, or that the manuscript circulated with an oral tradition of authorship by a political martyr. All these conjectures need further study (Ahmad's manuscript might be found either at the Asiatic Society in Kolkata or at the Felsted School, in Essex, England, where some of Phillott's documents are kept).¹⁷

Be that as it may, the mistake made Ahmad known as the translator of Hajji Baba.

1961-1966: Istanbul

For many years, Persian and English readers and scholars, working within a broadly "colonialist-orientalist" and "anti-colonialist" discourse, jointly entertained the idea that the political martyr Ahmad was also a heroic translator.¹⁸

Two events changed the narrative. First, a curious Persian doctoral student named Hassan Kamshad was at Cambridge, writing his thesis on Persian literature, when he came across Ahmad's letter to Browne. Kamshad reproduced a facsimile of Ahmad's letter and communicated his discovery to another Persian author, M. A. Jamalzadeh, who also came to take credit for the discovery. Kamshad's book was nonetheless published in English in 1966 and the misattribution of translatorship was made clear.¹⁹

The second event happened in Istanbul. In the 1960s, the Persian scholar Mojtaba Minovi was cataloging Persian manuscripts in Turkey when he came across Mirza's manuscript of *Hajji Baba* in the library of the University of Istanbul. He made a microfilm of the manuscript and gave it to the library of Tehran University. Gradually, Mirza was resurrected as the Persian translator.

Today's Persian readership can hardly remember Ahmad's glory as the translator, much as his transport of the text and tragic death were essential links between *Hajji Baba* and the Constitutional Revolution of 1905-1911. Among current Persian versions of the novel, the critical edition by Modarres Sadeghi (1379/2000) gives just credit to both Ahmad and Mirza as translatorial agents.²⁰

So the voice now belongs to someone called Mirza.

1886: Constantinople

Mirza Habib Isfahani ("Mirza") was a Persian dissident who made Constantinople his home. Born in Persia in 1836, Mirza completed studies in several fields including Islamic theology. He learned French and attained some fame as a poet. He was reportedly obliged to escape from Persia because of his political satire of Sepahsalar Mohammad Khan, the Qajar prime minister. Although Mirza denied the accusation and there is no evidence of the satirical poem, he arrived in Constantinople in 1866. Various historical documents report his career not only as a Persian scholar and translator, but also as a teacher of Arabic, Persian and French (albeit not English) in the Ottoman capital, where he kept a low profile in political circles.²¹

Yazici argues that Mirza translated *Hajji Baba* in 1886.²² On the first page of the handwritten manuscript, Mirza shows his awareness of the English and French versions of the novel, and indicates that he has worked from the French, naming himself rather modestly as "the most humble servant Habib Isfahani."²³

When Mirza died in 1893, the manuscript of the translation remained unpublished in Constantinople. There is some evidence that Mirza attempted to publish his translation but he would appear to have met with opposition from the censor during the period of Abdülhamit II

(1876-1908).²⁴ It would then be in the light of that failure that Ahmad undertook to copy the manuscript and take it into Persia, thus effectively saving Mirza's translatorship.

So we have the translator. But was the voice then his alone?

1824: Paris

The novel that Mirza translated had been published in Paris in 1824 by Haut-Coeur et Gayet jeune with the title *Hajji Baba, traduit de l'anglais par le traducteur des romans de Sir Walter Scott* (Hajji Baba, translated from English by the translator of the novels of Sir Walter Scott) - no author mentioned, and no translator named. Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832), the celebrated Scottish author who himself had a reputation for the anonymous publication of his Waverley novels, replaced both the author and the translator, thus securing authorship, translatorship, and sales.

The translator, mentioned in later editions, was Auguste Jean-Baptiste Defauconpret, a French lawyer who spent some 25 years in England and was the translator or co-translator of some 400 titles from English. The mystery is not in his undoubted professionalism.

1824: London

The novel that Defauconpret translated was called *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*, published in London by John Murray in 1824, the same year as the French translation – no author is mentioned, which might explain why there is no author mentioned on the subsequent French and Persian translations. This voice decidedly did not want to be named.

The second edition of the English text does nevertheless name the author as James Morier (1782-1877), about whom we actually know a good deal.

James Justinian Morier (1782-1877) was born of a Swiss father in Ottoman Izmir (in Turkey), worked as a diplomat in Persia, and accompanied a Persian dignitary on his travels to England, much in the manner of Hajji Baba himself. His was no doubt the voice situated closest to *Hajji*

Baba, as one might expect of authorship. As a writer, Morier knew how to respond to English curiosity about Persia, in the line of the several Europeans who had visited the country, and wrote meticulously on the land and its people, often with contempt for her backwardness but in awe of her ancient history.²⁵ In 1812 Morier published *A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia in the years 1808 and 1809*, in the preface to which we read:

Finding, on my arrival in England, that curiosity was quite alive to every thing connected with Persia, I was induced to publish the Memoranda which I had already made in that country; more immediately as I found that I had been fortunate enough to ascertain some facts, which had escaped the research of other travellers.²⁶

These previously “escaped” facts were so successful that Morier followed them in 1818 with *A Second Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople between the years 1810 and 1816*, indicating that he was writing while he travelled.

In travel-documentary mode, the author is clearly named, first in 1812 as “James Morier, Esq. His Majesty’s secretary of Embassy to the Court of Persia in 1812,” then in 1818 as “James Morier, Esq. Late His Majesty’s Secretary of Embassy and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of Persia, 1818.” In 1824, however, when Morier moves to fiction and places English in the mouth of a Persian picaresque hero, his name disappears from the book, ensuring at least some degree of anonymity (a reviewer actually misattributed the novel to Thomas Hope). According to Johnston, who has examined Morier’s and the publishers’ documents, Morier nevertheless “seems to have taken little trouble to conceal his authorship, for he was soon receiving direct compliments, and he was publicly identified as the author in the *Eclectic Review* of 21 April.”²⁷

The public anonymity was perhaps no more than a formal device, yet a device nevertheless, and by no means an isolated one. In the same years, John Malcolm’s *Sketches of Persia from the Journals of a Traveller in the East*, published in Philadelphia in 1827 by Carey, Lea, and Carey, had also no trace of the author’s name on the title page, nor on the page where the book was

dedicated to a certain John Fleming by “his most sincere and attached friend, the traveller.”²⁸ In intercultural uncertainty, the traveller, like the exile, might be a common identity.

The traveller reappears within Morier’s novel itself, where the narrator is named “Peregrine Persic” (Persian Wanderer) who is handed *Hajji Baba*’s manuscript as an unexpected gift. From that point on, whole story is a multilayered *manuscrit trouvé*: *Hajji Baba*’s manuscript is reportedly found and translated by the narrator Peregrine Persic, whose text was published anonymously in London in 1824, then found by an unnamed French translator, whose anonymous work was found and translated in Constantinople by Mirza, whose apparently anonymous text was transported by Ahmad, whose text was found by Phillott, and all that prior to Mirza’s manuscript being found in an Istanbul library in the 1960s, where even the authorship of the discovery is divided (as indeed is our own authorship here). No one particularly wanted to be identified as the one voice in the dissident text. Nor indeed is it easy to pin down the translators, who must have been part of that voice.

2011: Tarragona

Esmail has recently finished his doctoral thesis on translation and agency in Iran, and the story of Hajji Baba, just part of one chapter of the thesis, is a superb case of concealed and contested agency.²⁹ Yet doubts remain: If Mirza was indeed the translator, was he really working from the French or the English? So Anthony finds that a copy of the 1824 French translation is listed on the website of a bric-a-brac shop in Barcelona; Esmail buys the book; we sit down and read (Esmail with the English, Anthony with the French, Esmail looking at the Persian in cases of mismatch). But soon there is little doubt: where the English says “sixteen years ago,” the French says “il y a maintenant soixante ans” (i.e. sixty years), the Persian clearly follows the English, *et ainsi de suite*. So was Mirza actually working from the English? Not necessarily: it seems far

more likely that Phillott was correcting the Persian, undoing the French mistakes by following the English text. That much comparativism is easy (and it is the only contribution to which Anthony can lay any claim).

The passage that we began with, though, the critical comparison of modern Constantinople with religious Persia, does not appear in the English text. In the corresponding place, the narrator simply proclaims that the beauty of Constantinople surpasses that of Isfahan. That is, the particular passage we have cited is not a translation, at least not in any narrow sense. The anti-clerical comparison of Persia with the Ottoman capital would seem to have been made by the momentarily non-translating translator Mirza, and then left strangely uncorrected by the pedagogical military editor Phillott, who otherwise removed deviances from the English text. In all likelihood, the voice was from a dissident in Constantinople, allowed and consecrated by a British major who otherwise concealed his allegiances.

Through all the hidden detours and subterfuge of translational communication, a critical voice could thus speak, from neither wholly within nor wholly without, as at once author, translator and editor, about the values of the Persian political and religious regime.

Envoi 1 (Esmaeil)

Esmaeil's question is about agency: Who has the power to do what in the field of translation? He has dug deep into the details of the various agents surrounding this voice; the research and the recounted details are all his, including the discovery of the non-translational comparison. Further data and contextualization can be found in his article "Agency in the translation and production of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* into Persian,"³⁰ which uses this story to show that "in spite of the illusory, disempowering nature of exile, translation agents are capable of exercising, transferring, and risking their agency within intercultural transfers."³¹

Envoi 2 (Anthony)

Anthony's concern is inculturation: How does the culture of modernity – of technology, participative democracy, universal education and open rational meritocratic debate (to speak with Habermas) – how does that culture bring other cultures into its fold? How does modernity itself change in the process? That problematic is his. And as Esmail and Anthony worked on these questions, through most of 2011, voices of dissent were undoing despotic regimes in important parts of the Islamic world, as they keep trying to do in much of the rest. Our study of *Hajji Baba* was framed by a violent and impassioned history, which we would see as more than a tale of Twitter and cell phones.

Modernization, translation and generalized agency

Anthony's broad question, with its theorization drawn from the Catholic Church, was presented at a seminar at the Nida Institute for Translation Studies in New York in September 2011, and the first paragraphs of the present text are from that paper.³² So, too, the following few paragraphs, about why this particular voice could be important.

How does modernity spread? That is, how do people come to aspire to generalized agency? How are they moved to see science, technology, and education as ways of extending social communication, to the point where all might feel authors of their laws? The question does not concern the success of any particular brand of democracy, the necessary technologies and the concomitant alienation, nor should it be undermined by the necessary elites through which messages are moved and transformed. The question does not address postmodernism, the pre-condition of which must surely be the modernity that most of the world still awaits. The question simply concerns the aspiration. How do people come to aspire to such things? How does that modernity spread?

In a recent article, Omid Azadibougar posits that modernity cannot spread through translation. His basic argument seems to be that since modernity requires self-reflexivity, it cannot be “referential,” in the sense that it cannot be something that people believe exists somewhere else: it must always be here and now. We might find that distinction in the reported first reception *Hajji Baba* as a fully Persian picaresque, when it was seen as witty and perceptive self-reflection, then becoming unacceptable as soon as it was viewed in a referential light, as having been transferred from abroad. Azadibougar argues that translation in such circumstances can only achieve a transfer of authoritative instance, legitimating the aspirations of a very narrow educated social class:

[...] the only significant change effected by the Iranian turn to “modernity” through translation might have been the replacement of the master religious narrative (absolute 1) by the master European narrative (absolute 2) for that so-called “progressive” class of society.

However, the culture remained fundamentally referential, locating knowledge externally, and transcendently constructing a new organization of socio-cultural life. This would include the hypothetical condition in which translation were capable of importing knowledge completely, that is if it had managed to bring the whole of European knowledge into the Iranian cultural sphere without a trace of loss or fragmentation; even then, “modernization” would have remained referential, not having achieved the condition of the modern: critical immanent self-reflexiveness.³³

In the more clearly reactionary part of Azadibougar’s argument, the modernizing translations into Persian would have a negative effect on cultural authenticity and unity: “translation has led to cultural instability and de-authentication of literary products.”³⁴ Through translation, “the Persian language was hollowed out and lost touch with reality. [...] Divorcing its own reality has led to a ‘double reality’ or ‘double consciousness:’ one subjected and immediate, but postponed, the other dominant and remote, but desired.”³⁵

As in so much narrative analysis, the categories here do not rise above static and opposed identities. Only two places operate in this reductive view of translation: here and there, home and away, the authentic and the imposed, the autochthon and the translator, as if there were never

more than two options. That is, there is no place for the translating itself. Nor is there any awareness of a non-narrative identity, at least of a kind beyond self-characterization and self-justification: nothing about any identity in becoming, constructed with and through the other, in dialogue and negotiation. Instead, apparently, we have the blunt impossibility of modernity through translation, based on the precarious referential assumption that the modernist paradise had somehow been completely perfected elsewhere in the world. Through translation, indeed through any act of comparison, modernity should simply not be able to move, by definition. *Eppur...*

Bibliography

Armaghan, A Persian Journal. Nos. 2-3 (1308/1929): 110-120.³⁶

AZADIBOUGAR, Omid. "Translation historiography in the Modern World: Modernization and translation into Persian." *Target* 22, no. 2(2010): 298–329.

BONAKDARIAN, Mansour. "India viii. Relations: Qajar Period, the 19th Century." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, <<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/india-viii-relations-qajar-period-the-19th-century>>. Website consulted December 30, 2011.

BROWNE, Edward. "Introduction." In *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*. James Morier. London: Methuen, 1895, pp. ix-xxiii.

BROWNE, Edward G. *The Persian Revolution: 1905-1909*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

GREEN, Nile. "The Madrasas of Oxford: Iranian Interactions with the English Universities in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Iranian Studies* 44, no. 6 (2011): 807-829.

HADDADIAN-MOGHADDAM, Esmail. "Agency in the Translation and Production of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* into Persian." *Target* 23, no. 2 (2011): 206–234.

HARBSMEIER, Michael. "Hajji Baba in England: zur Wechselwirkung persisch-englischer Fremd- und Selbstbilder im 19. Jahrhundert." In *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*. Ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1997, pp. 69-87.

HUSĀM AL-DAULAH, Timūr Mīrzā. *The Bāz-nāma-yi Nāsirī: A Persian Treatise on Falconry*. Trans. Douglas Craven Phillott. London: B. Quaritch, 1908. <<http://www.archive.org/details/bznmayinsiraper00philgoog>>. Website consulted March 14, 2012.

ISFAHANI, Mirza Habib, Unpublished manuscript, undated.

JOHNSTON, Henry McKenzie. *Ottoman and Persian Odysseys: James Morier, Creator of Hajji Baba of Ispahan, and his Brothers*. London: British Academic Press, 1998.

KAMSHAD, Hassan. *Modern Persian Prose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

KEDDIE, Nikkie R. *Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003.

MALCOLM, John. *Sketches of Persia from the Journals of a Traveller in the East*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Carey, 1828.

MODARRES SADEGHI, Jaafar, ed. *Sarguzasht-i Hajji Baba-yi Isfahani* [Persian translation of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*]. Tehran: Markaz, 1379/2000.

MORIER, James. *A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia in the years 1808 and 1809*. London: Longman, Hurst, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster, 1812.

MORIER, James. *A Second Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople between the years 1810 and 1816*. London: Longman, Hurst, Orme, and Brown, 1818.

MORIER, James. *Hajji Baba, traduit de l'anglais par le traducteur des romans de Sir Walter Scott*. French translation by Auguste Jean-Baptiste Defauconpret, 4 vols. Paris: Haut-Coeur et Gayet, 1824.

MORIER, James. *The Adventures of Hajji Baba in England*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1828.

MORIER, James. *Zohrab: the Hostage*. 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley, 1832.

OUSELEY, William. *Travels in Various Countries of the East; More particularly Persia*, 2 vols, London: Rodwell and Martin, 1819.

PAKER, Saliha. "Turkish Tradition." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker. London and New York: Routledge, 1998, pp. 571-582.

PHILLOTT, Douglas Craven. "Introduction." In *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan. Translated from English into Persian by Haji Shaikh Ahmad-iKirmani and edited with notes by Major D. C. Phillott*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1905, pp. vii-x.

POLAK, Jakob Eduard. *Persien: Das Land und seine Bewohner: Ethnographische Schilderungen*. 2 vols, Leipzig, 1865.

PYM, Anthony. "On inculturation." Draft for a talk at the Nida School of Translation Studies, New York, September 14, 2011. <http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/online/intercultures/2011_inculturation.pdf>. Website consulted December 30, 2011.

SHCHEGLOVA, Olimpiada P. "Lithography ii. In India." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, 2009. <<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/lithography-ii-in-india>>. Website consulted December 30, 2011.

WRIGHT, Denis. *The English amongst the Persians: Imperial Lives in Nineteenth-Century Iran*. London: Heinemann, 1977.

YAZICI, Tahsin, 2002. "Ḥabīb esfahāni." *Encyclopædia Iranica*, 2002.
<<http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/habib-esfahani>>. Website consulted December 30, 2011.

Notes

¹ To make a distinction, *Hajji Baba* in italics refers to Morier's book, *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* (1824), whereas Hajji Baba as such refers to the hero of the book.

² *The Adventures of Haji Baba of Ispahan. Translated from English into Persian by Haji Shaikh Ahmad-i Kirmani and edited with notes by Major D. C. Phillott* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1905), p. 397.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in the article are by Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam.

⁴ See Edward G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution: 1905-1909* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910).

⁵ Michael Harbsmeier, "Hajji Baba in England: zur Wechselwirkung persisch-englischer Fremd- und Selbstbilder im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Übersetzung als Repräsentation fremder Kulturen*, ed. Doris Bachmann-Medick (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1997), p. 70.

⁶ For an interesting account, see Nile Green, "The Madrasas of Oxford: Iranian Interactions with the English Universities in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Iranian Studies* 44, no. 6 (2011), pp. 807-829.

⁷ See Olimpiada P. Shcheglova, "Lithography ii. In India," *Encyclopædia Iranica* (2009).

⁸ Mansour Bonakdarian, "India viii. Relations: Qajar Period, the 19th Century," *Encyclopædia Iranica* (2004).

⁹ The digital copy of Phillott's version is available online at:
<http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3487498>.

¹⁰ Douglas Craven Phillott, "Introduction," in *The Adventures of Haji Baba of Ispahan. Translated from English into Persian by Haji Shaikh Ahmad-i Kirmani and edited with notes by Major D. C. Phillott* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1905), p. vi.

¹¹ Edward Browne, "Introduction," in *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*, James Morier (London: Methuen, 1895), p. ix.

¹² Douglas Craven Phillott, "Introduction," p. iv.

¹³ Husām al-Daulah Timūr ibn Husain 'Alī Mīrzā, *The Bāz-nāma-yi Nāsirī: A Persian Treatise on Falconry*, trans. Douglas Craven Phillott (London: B. Quaritch, 1908).

¹⁴ Nikkie R. Keddie, *Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 43-48.

¹⁵ Jaafar Moddarres Sadeghi, ed. *Sarguzasht-i Hajji Baba-yi Isfahani* [Persian translation of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan*] (Tehran: Markaz, 1379/2000).

¹⁶ Edward G. Brown, *The Persian Revolution: 1905-1909* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910).

¹⁷ Our thanks to Richard Dawkins, archivist of Felsted School, Essex, England. Information on Phillott is available at <<http://archives.felsted.org/of/about/DCPH1874/>>.

¹⁸ See Kamran Rastegar, "The Unexpected Gift: The Adventures of Hajji Baba Ispahani as a Transactional Text between English and Persian Literatures," *Middle Eastern Literatures* 10, no.

3 (2007): 251–271; cf. Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam, “Agency in the Translation and Production of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* into Persian,” *Target* 23, no. 2 (2011), pp. 206–234.

¹⁹ Hassan Kamshad, *Modern Persian Prose* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 22–23.

²⁰ Year 1379 refers to the Iranian Solar Hejri calendar, followed by its equivalent Christian year.

²¹ See the journal *Armaghan* (1308/1929): pp. 111–112.

²² Tahsin Yazici, “Ḥabib esfahāni” *Encyclopædia Iranica* (2002).

²³ Mirza Habib Isfahani, Unpublished manuscript, undated, p. 2.

²⁴ See Saliha Parker, “Turkish Tradition,” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Ed. Mona Baker (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 571–582.

²⁵ See, among others, William Ouseley, *Travels in Various Countries of the East; More particularly Persia*, 2 vols (London: Rodwell and Martin, 1819); John Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia from the Journals of a Traveller in the East* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Carey, 1828); Eduard Jakob Polak, *Persien: Das Land und seine Bewohner: Ethnographische Schilderungen*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1865); and Denis Wright, *The English amongst the Persians: Imperial Lives in Nineteenth-Century Iran* (London: Heinemann, 1977).

²⁶ James Morier, *A Journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia in the years 1808 and 1809* (London: Longman, Hurst, Orme, and Brown Paternosterrow, 1812), p. vii.

²⁷ Henry McKenzie Johnston, *Ottoman and Persian Odysseys: James Morier, Creator of Hajji Baba of Ispahan, and his Brothers* (London: British Academic Press, 1998), p. 213.

²⁸ John Malcolm, *Sketches of Persia from the Journals of a Traveller in the East* (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Carey, 1828), p. iii.

²⁹ Esmaeil Haddadian-Moghaddam, *Agency in the Translation and Production of Novels from English in Modern Iran*. Doctoral Thesis. Universitat Rovira in Virgili. Available at <<http://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/84028>>.

³⁰ See Haddadian-Moghaddam, “Agency in the Translation and Production of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* into Persian.” See also note 15.

³¹ Haddadian-Moghaddam, “Agency in the Translation and Production of *The Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan* into Persian,” p. 227.

³² Anthony Pym, “On inculturation,” Draft for a talk at the Nida School of Translation Studies, New York, September 14, 2011.

³³ Omid Azadibougar, “Translation historiography in the Modern World: Modernization and translation into Persian,” *Target* 22, no. 2 (2010): p. 314.

³⁴ Azadibougar, “Translation historiography in the Modern World: Modernization and translation into Persian,” p. 317.

³⁵ Azadibougar, “Translation historiography in the Modern World: Modernization and translation into Persian,” p. 315.

³⁶ See note 20 to make sense of the Persian date.